



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

INVENTOR(S) : Mishra et al.
TITLE : IMAGING MEMBER HAVING A DUAL
CHARGE TRANSPORT LAYER
APPLICATION NO. : 10/734,380
FILED : December 12, 2003
CONFIRMATION NO. : 9765
EXAMINER : Janis L. Dote
ART UNIT : 1756
NOTICE OF ALLOWANCE : December 15, 2005
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. : A2582-US-NP
XERZ 2 00610

CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAILING UNDER 37 CFR 1.10

"Express Mail" Mailing Label Number: EV 690738014 US

Date of Deposit: January 10, 2006

I hereby certify that the attached Fee(s) Transmittal Form, Issue Fee, Publication Fee, Response to Statement of Reasons for Allowance and "Fee Address" Indication Form are being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Lynda S. Kalemba
(Typed or Printed Name of Sender)

Lynda S. Kalemba _____
Signature Date
January 10, 2006

I hereby certify that this paper, and all documents indicated therein as being attached are being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, Mail Stop Issue Fee, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

By: Lynda S. Kalemba
Lynda S. Kalemba

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

INVENTOR(S)

Mishra et al.

TITLE

IMAGING MEMBER HAVING A DUAL CHARGE TRANSPORT LAYER

APPLICATION NO.

10/734,380

FILED

December 12, 2003

CONFIRMATION NO.

9765

EXAMINER

Janis L. Dote

ART UNIT

1756

ALLOWED

December 15, 2005

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

A2582-US-NP
XERZ 2 00610



RESPONSE TO STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Mail Stop Issue Fee

Dear Sir:

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication as to the allowance of the present application.

However, applicants respectfully submit the Statements of Reasons for Allowance are, in and of themselves, inappropriate. It is noted that the reasons for allowance may be set forth in instances in which ". . . the Examiner believes that the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear his or her reasons for allowing a claim or claims." (37 CFR §1.104(e)(2004)). In the present case, applicants believe the

record as a whole does make the reasons for allowance clear and, therefore, no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted. Furthermore, the applicants do not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance.

Specifically, it has been indicated that the claims are allowed by importing interpretations into the claims in relation to the prior art that results in a potential imprecise and/or inaccurate understanding of the reasons. This places an unwarranted interpretation upon the claims. Such a characterization of the claims does not properly take into account applicants' claimed invention as reflected in the specification and the applicants' responses to the Examiner's office actions.

Therefore, while applicants believe the claims are allowable, applicants do not acquiesce that patentability resides in only the features, exactly as expressed in the claims, nor that each feature is required for patentability.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

1/4/2006
Date


Richard M. Klein

Reg. No. 33,000
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582